

SECRET  
(When Filled In)

Approved For Release 2004/11/30 : CIA-RDP78B04770A000700040090-3  
CONTRACT INSPECTION REPORT

25X1

TO:

ENGINEERING SECTION/CB/PD/OL

DATE

1 Nov 64

INSPECTION REPORT NO. (If final, so state)

4

ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE

19 June 66

NAME OF CONTRACTOR

Declass Review by NGA.

TYPE OF COMMODITY OR SERVICE

Study on PI Performance

THE CONTRACTOR IS ON SCHEDULE

☒ YES

☐ NO

THE CONTRACTOR WILL PROBABLY REMAIN WITHIN ALLOCATED FUNDS ☒ YES ☐ NO IF ANSWER IS "NO" ADVISE RECOMMENDATION AND/OR ACTION OF SPONSORING OFFICE, ON REVERSE HEREOF. IF KNOWN, INDICATE MAGNITUDE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS INVOLVED.

PER CENT OF WORK COMPLETED 15% of 2-yr effort  
80% of accelerated study

HAS AN INTERIM REPORT, FINAL REPORT, PROTOTYPE, OR OTHER END ITEM BEEN RECEIVED FROM THE CONTRACTOR DURING THE PERIOD? ☒ YES ☐ NO (If yes, give details on reverse side.) PI test and response sheets

HAS GOVERNMENT-OWNED PROPERTY BEEN DELIVERED TO CONTRACTOR DURING THIS PERIOD? ☐ YES ☒ NO (If yes, indicate items, quantity, and cost on reverse side.)

OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF CONTRACTOR

1. ☐ OUTSTANDING

3. ☐ ABOVE AVERAGE

5. ☐ BELOW AVERAGE 7. ☐ UNSATISFACTORY

2. ☐ EXCELLENT

4. ☒ AVERAGE

6. ☐ BARELY ADEQUATE

IF OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF CONTRACTOR IS UNSATISFACTORY OR BARELY ADEQUATE, INDICATE REASONS ON REVERSE SIDE.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

☒ CONTINUE AS PROGRAMMED

☐ WITHHOLD PAYMENT PENDING SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE

☐ TERMINATE

☐ OTHER (Specify)

IF TERMINATION IS RECOMMENDED OR IF THIS IS A FINAL REPORT ATTACH COMMENTS IN NARRATIVE FORM ON CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE AND CERTIFY THAT ALL DELIVERABLE ITEMS UNDER THE CONTRACT HAVE BEEN RECEIVED. THESE INCLUDE, WHERE APPLICABLE, THE FOLLOWING:

ITEM	REC'D	DOES NOT APPLY	ITEM	REC'D	DOES NOT APPLY
PROTOTYPES			MANUALS		
DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS			FINAL REPORT		
PRODUCTION AND/OR OTHER END ITEMS			SPECIAL TOOLING		
			OTHER GOVERNMENT PROPERTY		

DATE OF LAST CONTACT WITH CONTRACTOR

21 Oct 64

DIVISION

P&DS

25X1

In-house testing did not commence until the week of 19 October, but since the contractor is working on an accelerated study at our special request, the time schedule is a product of his best effort, which is being closely monitored.

25X1 [redacted] worked at NPIC facilities the weeks of 12-16 and 19-21 October drawing up the final tests, which they administered for the first three day's sessions. Administering of tests was from then on assumed by in-house personnel, and

25X1 [redacted] returned to the West Coast to begin scoring completed tests. Each day's tests were thereafter airmailed to Human Factors. Scoring evidently required at least six of 25X1 [redacted] professional staff members since the test was open-ended in design and required careful analysis of individual responses.

25X1 [redacted] reported to us on 27 October that responses on the tests which had been scored to that date were of low efficiency and showed confusion and failure to discriminate on the part of the PI's participating. Tests could therefore not be scored as originally intended, and any scoring key would involve extreme complexities which cannot be afforded in time alone.

Modifications to the experimental design were made immediately and testing was to be resumed 2 November with [redacted] administering. The change involved a focusing down of the questions from open target areas to individual circled aircraft. (Modification was justified on the basis that a scanning task is not part of the problem of detail identification called for by the range of resolutions being considered.) 25X1 ILLEGIB